

REMARKS

Claims 1-20 are rejected. Claim 8 is herein canceled. Various claims are herein amended. New claims 21 – 26 have been added. It is respectfully submitted that no new matter has been entered through the various claim amendments or new claims. Further, upon belief, it is submitted that this paper is fully responsive to the outstanding Office Action.

Specification

The Examiner alleges that the Specification has not been checked to the extent necessary to determine the presence of all possible minor errors, and requests Applicants cooperation in correcting such errors.

Upon review of the Specification, Applicants are unable to find such errors. It is submitted that the Specification would apprise one of ordinary skill in the art of the subject matter contained therein and satisfies the respective statutory requirement 35 U.S.C. § 112.

Claim Objections

Claim 13 was objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.75(c), as allegedly being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

The Examiner states that “caused to be present” in claim 1 and “supplied” in claim 13 are same. However, “caused to be present” in claim 1 is the description about the generic concept limiting presenting an aqueous liquid on an adhering surface, and for the more limitative concept thereof, the provision of an aqueous liquid is limited to supply:

as shown in Fig. 1 and the like, an adhering surface (in claim 13);

an adhesive layer on the side of a transparent protective film (in claim 14); and

an adhesive layer on the side of a polarizer (in claim 15).

Furthermore, there are embodiments of claims 16 and 17.

As such, it is respectfully requested that the objection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §112

The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 1-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. More specifically, the Examiner contends that the recitation (which was added as an amendment) of claim 1 of “an aqueous liquid, which comprises no adhesives” is not adequately supported by the Specification as filed.

Claim 1 is amended to recite, “a method for manufacturing a polarizing plate comprising a transparent protective film provided on at least one surface of a polarizer with an adhesive layer interposed therebetween, comprising: coating an adhesive on a surface of the transparent protective film to form the adhesive layer and/or coating an adhesive on a surface of the polarizer, to form the adhesive layer, and thereafter, adhering the transparent protective film and the polarizer continuously to each other with the adhesive layer interposed therebetween, while presenting an aqueous liquid, which consists of water or consists essentially of water, on an adhering surface between the transparent protective film and the polarizer, wherein a thickness of the adhesive layer is in the range of 30 to 300 nm.” It is submitted that claim 1 now fully satisfies the written description requirement under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. Claims 2-7

and 9-20 which depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1 are patentable for at least the reason of their dependency therefrom.

In view of the amendments to claim 1, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 1-4, 6, 8-11 and 13-20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Higashio et al. (US 2003/0072078 A1) in view of Rogers (US 2,263,249).

The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 is amended to include a somewhat similar feature to that of cancelled claim 8. As such, claim 1 is amended to recite, “a method for manufacturing a polarizing plate comprising a transparent protective film provided on at least one surface of a polarizer with an adhesive layer interposed therebetween, comprising: coating an adhesive on a surface of the transparent protective film to form the adhesive layer and/or coating an adhesive on a surface of the polarizer, to form the adhesive layer, and thereafter, adhering the transparent protective film and the polarizer continuously to each other with the adhesive layer interposed therebetween, while presenting an aqueous liquid, which consists of water or consists essentially of water, on an adhering surface between the transparent protective film and the polarizer, wherein a thickness of the adhesive layer is in the range of 30 to 300 nm.” It is respectfully submitted that the cited art fails to describe or teach at least the aforementioned recitations of claim 1.

In the outstanding Office Action, the Examiner concedes at page 4 that, “Higashio fails to disclose the use of an aqueous liquid, which comprises no adhesives on the adhering surface when the polarizer and transparent film layer are adhered.” Further, the Examiner contends at page 5 that, “Rogers teaches a method for making a laminated light polarizer whereby a polyvinyl alcohol based adhesive is used and water is applied to the bonding surface for the purpose of insuring uniform contact between the polarizing film and a substrate (column 4, lines 40-45).”

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that the Examiner has not fully appreciated the recitations of claim 1; specifically, that the transparent protective film and the polarizer are continuously adhered to each other with the adhesive layer interposed therebetween. Additionally, the Examiner fails to address the “continuously adhered to” recitation of claim 1 in the outstanding Office Action. It is submitted that the continuous adhering is one of the features of the present application, and Higashio (US 2003/00720078) does not describe continuous adhering.

In addition, as for the description of Rogers (US 2,263,249), there is no description about an adhesive layer (upon adhesion, PVA is heated to make PVA soft), and that the description of Rogers implies no idea of setting an adhesive layer in addition to a polarizer. In addition, Rogers is different from the present application in that the subject to which a polarizer is adhered to is glass. As described above, Rogers is a reference which cannot be applied to Higashio. As such, the present application is not obvious on the basis of Rogers and Higashio.

Further, it appears that the Examiner erroneously assumes the thickness of the adhesive layer of Claim 8 (added to Claim 1 by amendment) to be “30 to 300 μm ” instead of “30 to 300 nm”. Accordingly, Higashio does not describe the thickness of an adhesive layer as recited in claim 1 of the present application.

As for claim 11, the Examiner states that it is obvious on the basis of the description about an adhesive of Higashio, similarly to Claim 6.

However, claim 11 describes that the aqueous liquid contains a crosslinking agent, but there is no description about an adhesive. Regarding claim 11, it is submitted that the Examiner confuses an aqueous liquid and an adhesive.

Accordingly, Rogers, alone or in combination with Higashio, fails to describe or teach at least the aforementioned recitations of claim 1.

Claims 3, 4, 6, 9-11 and 13-20 which depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 1 are patentable for at least the reason of their dependency therefrom.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Higashio et al. (US 2003/0072078 A1) in view of Rogers (US 2,263,249), as applied to claim 1 above, in view of either Applicant’s admitted prior art or Shuichi et al. (JP 7198945).

The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 5 depends indirectly from claim 1 and is patentable for at least the reason of its dependency therefrom. Further, the comments present above regarding independent claim 1 are

applicable here where appropriate. The other cited references (Applicant's related art or Shuichi et al.) fail to remedy the above stated deficiencies of Higashio and Rogers.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 7 and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Higashio et al. (US 2003/0072078 A1) in view of Rogers (US 2,263,249), as applied to claim 1 above, in view of either Okazaki et al. (US 5,945,209) of general knowledge in the art.

The rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 7 and 12 depend indirectly from claim 1 and is patentable for at least the reason of its dependency therefrom. Further, the comments present above regarding independent claim 1 are applicable here where appropriate. The other cited references (Okazaki et al. or general knowledge in the art) fail to remedy the above stated deficiencies of Higashio and Rogers.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

New Claims

New claims 21-26 are herein added. It is respectfully submitted that the cited art fails to describe the recitations contained respectively in claims 21-26.

Support for the new claims may be found in at least:

Claim 21: a transport velocity in paragraph [0075],

Claim 22: a supply quantity of the aqueous liquid in paragraph [0079],

Claim 23: supply time of the aqueous liquid in paragraph [0085], and

Claims 24-26, dependent on claim 1, are based on paragraph [0064] of the present application.

Also, the added claims related to the above-mentioned amendment of claim 1 are effective in promoting efficiency of continuous adhering.

Additionally, as column 3, line 2 of Rogers describes that the concentration of a solution which forms a PVA adhesive layer is "10%," it is different from claim 26 of the present application in concentration. There are apparent disadvantages that when the above-mentioned concentration is high, streaky unevenness is generated, and the like.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, Applicants submit that that the claims, as herein amended, are in condition for allowance. Applicants request such action at an early date.


If the Examiner believes that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

Application No.: 10/573,706
Art Unit: 1791

Response under 37 C.F.R. §1.111
Attorney Docket No.: 062287

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,
WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP



Joseph W. Iskra
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 57,485
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

LCW/JWI/jac